



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Classical Philology

VOLUME XIII

July 1918

NUMBER 3

THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF AN ANCIENT CITY

BY TENNEY FRANK

In a previous paper I attempted to secure data from inscriptional material regarding the methods and the scale of production in some typical Roman industries of the Augustan period. I wish now to approach the problem from a different point of view by examining the economic machinery in actual operation in Pompeii, the only ancient city which we are now able to restore. To be sure there is a tendency to avoid illustrating Roman life with Pompeian practices, since Pompeii was rather small and furthermore lay so far south as to fall very readily under Greek influences. This might make a serious difference, since Greeks always looked with a kindlier eye upon industry and menial occupations than did the rather old-fashioned Junkers of the agricultural-militaristic aristocracy of Rome. And yet Pompeii proves upon intimate acquaintance to represent fairly well the average life of Rome. A city of twenty-five thousand souls was rather more significant in those days than it is now; and the dominant class in Pompeii's politics and society were the well-to-do landlords that had descended from Sulla's Roman veterans. For their manners and their ideals they doubtless looked to Rome. Indeed if it were possible today to recover a few blocks of the *via Patricia* of Rome as it appeared in Nero's day we should find some difficulty in distinguishing it from a street in Pompeii. There would be the same succession of open booths and workshops hiding the dwellings within; the houses with their wall decorations in the third

and fourth styles, their Hellenistic figurines and rococo furniture would differ but little; the same mixture of broken Latin and Greek *koine* would be heard on the streets and in the shops.¹

At Pompeii, as was usual in the ancient walled towns where space must be carefully husbanded, shops line all the busy thoroughfares, while houses of residence subside to the centers of the blocks. Since this system obtains throughout the city I shall first examine a typical insula,² No. II of Regio VII, in order to trace some lines of connection between the industries and the social classes. The insula contains about forty shops and booths strung out mainly along the busier streets—*Stabiana* and *Augustali*—besides some ten residences crowded into the center with hallways usually opening into one of the quieter streets. The first large house on *via Stabiana* (No. 6) belonged to Paquius Proculus, a very popular baker, who reached the high office of the duumvirate apparently by an overwhelming majority,³ and was proud enough of the fact to have his portrait, genial and sufficiently apologetic if rather unintellectual, painted, appropriately in white toga, upon the wall of his tablinum.⁴ With this house he has combined the adjacent one, sacrificing the gardens of both for mill and workrooms of his bakery. And yet, though the owner was willing to live within sound of his mills, he did not choose to display his wares directly in the five shops that lined the front of his home. These shops are all independent of the house. To judge from an election notice⁵ which appears near by, Proculus owned a fairly large bread and cake shop on the opposite corner (Reg. IX, 3, 10) to which also was attached a bakery with five mills. Here there was less danger perhaps of flecking his judicial toga with the dust of his calling. Be that as it may, it is interesting to find this *duumvir*

¹ It is not yet possible to secure final results in an economic study of Pompeii because of the inadequate reports published. Very often trifling objects such as nails, clay whorls, trinkets of no artistic value, which the excavators fail to notice or at least to publish, are useful in determining the nature of a shop or booth. We need a thorough republication of Pompeii on topographical lines by scholars who know the meaning not only of art but also of economic and social history.

² See map in *CIL*, IV, Suppl. II; Niccolini, *Le case ed i monumenti*, II, 42–45, and III, *I mestieri e le industrie*; Fiorelli, *Descrizione di Pompei*, p. 184.

³ *CIL*, IV, 1122.

⁴ See Mau-Kelsey, *Pompeii, Its Life and Art* (2d ed.), p. 477.

⁵ *CIL*, IV, 3651.

juredicundo actively engaged in an expanding business of milling, baking, and patisserie. He may fairly represent the prosperous industrial class to which the petty aristocracy of Pompeii's municipal officials largely belonged.

No. 11 is a house of moderate size which was turned into a dyeing establishment in the early empire when the clothing industry became important in Pompeii. It is indeed characteristic of the conservative industrial tendencies of Pompeii that the proprietor did not build a place to suit his needs but installed himself in a house built for domestic use, where, of course, the rooms were by no means adapted for his purposes. The proprietor, like Proculus the baker, apparently used a part of the house as a dwelling-place.

The next residence of note is No. 16. It is spacious, contains a handsome peristyle, and has supplied several noteworthy frescoes to the Naples museum.¹ Its owner was M. Gavius Rufus, a man of some wealth, who was once aedile and who, whether or no with success, offered himself as candidate for the duumvirate. What his source of income was we do not know; his house is not physically connected with any shop or booth.

Next door (No. 18) lived C. Vibius, probably he of the cognomen Severus, since the dozen election placards of Vibius Severus are all found in the immediate neighborhood of our No. 18. If so he also entertained the ambition of becoming duumvir. He too turned the rear part of his house into a workshop, for the chambers beside the peristyle were used as store-cabinets whence there was direct communication with the shop upon the back street.

N. Popidius Priscus dwelt in the next house (No. 20, Casa dei Marmi²), the largest and most handsomely decorated in the block and apparently, long in the possession of the family, since the family name appears in Oscan on an old stone inscription in the peristyle.³ Yet the source of this display is readily disclosed to anyone who will follow the three several doors that lead from the house to various shops in other parts of the block. Indeed there was found in the house a bronze stamp such as bakers use to trade-mark their cakes,

¹ E.g., *Mus. Cat.* Nos. 1381, 1383, 1385.

² See Helbig, *Wandgemälde*, p. 475.

³ There were magistrates of this family in the Oscan period; see Conway, *Italic Dialects*, pp. 61 ff.

and this stamp bore the name of Popidius. The excavator was therefore not surprised to find a door leading from the *atrium* of this house into a prosperous bakery at the corner. Here were five mills of the usual type made to be drawn by horses, a cunningly contrived machine for kneading dough, a baker's oven having a capacity of perhaps two thousand loaves per day, and a number of cake forms, but no display counters nor doors inviting the purchaser. Popidius may have had his sales shop elsewhere or he may have disposed of his wares wholesale. But this was not his only investment. In the rear of his house a door led to a spacious barroom (No. 47) with many wine jars and a hospitable double door upon the street. Finally another rear door led to a complex of rooms (No. 38) which appears to constitute a workshop terminating in two salesrooms upon the street—but we do not know what was produced and sold here. Whatever the various sources of his income, the sum total was not small, judging from the magnificence of his house.

No. 35 is a house of moderate size which is characteristic of a very large class at Pompeii, in that it connects directly with two workshops upon the street, Nos. 27 and 30. The former contains a fixed workbench and a small furnace in one of its two small rooms, but there is nothing in No. 30 to indicate the character of its products.

Finally, No. 44, Casa del Orso,¹ is a charming little house that had fallen upon evil days, for surely it could hardly have kept the respectability which the paintings and mosaics bespeak after the porter's lodge had become the wine shop of one named, or rather nicknamed, Hedone. Indeed it is a likely conjecture that the house became a clubhouse of none too good repute, since the sign-painter who posted the election notices of a much advertised candidate called the inhabitants of the place *seribibi*.²

¹ See Helbig, *loc. cit.*

² *CIL*, IV, 581, *M. Cerrinium Vatiā aed. o.u.f. seribibi universi rogant. scr. Florus cum Fructo*. Three doors to the left of this, at the barroom connected with Priscus' house *CIL*, IV, 575 was found, which reads: *Vatiā aed. rogant—dormientes universi*; while between these two was found No. 576, *Vatiā aed. Furunculi rog.* These notices were probably not painted with malicious intent, since if one desired to damage the candidate by accusing him of a corrupt following one would make the charge in a part of the city where good repute was respected, and not at the end of the Vico del Lupanare. Besides, the sign-painters, Florus and Fructus, who signed No. 581, were apparently in the regular employ of this candidate (cf. Nos. 95, 230, 387, 803).

Such were the houses that hid within and fed upon the encircling row of petty shops bordering the four streets. They give us a picture—proved true to type by the study of other blocks—of a society somewhat less provincially aristocratic, a trifle more worldly-wise, than that which Rome's staid literature deigns to notice. These men who had their courtyards decorated with marble cupids and fauns, their dining-room walls frescoed with legends out of Homer and Euripides, the men whom their fellow-townsmen elected to the highest municipal positions¹ of trust and expensive honors, these leading citizens of Pompeii were, to some extent, her prosperous bakers, potters, and tanners, and they did not scorn to draw their livelihood from shops and booths if only the accumulated profits summed up large enough.

But the great number of doors in this block lead merely to independent one- two- or three-room shops and other small shops connected by a stairway with a balcony room or two. Here it was that the "other half," or rather the other nine-tenths, lived packed in the narrowest of quarters with the typical work- and salesrooms upon the street. These are in fact the very essence of ancient industry with its inordinate number of petty specialists. Their purpose is often betrayed by two distinguishing marks: some remnant of a workbench, forge, or furnace, which proves the inhabitant an artisan, and a peculiar wide lintel with its grooves, which shows that in the daytime the shop stood wide open to invite customers. The well-known picture of the cupids as goldsmiths² gives precisely the right

¹ Besides those already mentioned we know of several other houses of *duoviri* and of candidates for that office, from which it is possible in some measure to gauge the social pretensions of this class. *Vedius Siricus*, II vir in 60 A.D., lived at VII, 1, 47, a house of no mean wealth (see Overbeck-Mau, p. 320). The startling mosaic "*Salve Lucru*" which greets the visitor at the door does not indeed reveal the man's occupation, but it may justify the conjecture that he was not a poet or a schoolmaster. In the famous "house of the citharist" (I, 4) where so many excellent paintings were found (Mau-Kelsey, p. 352) lived the *duovir* *L. Popidius Secundus* who attained the high dignity of the Augustiani. Among well-advertised candidates for the highest offices were also *M. Lucretius Fronto* whose delightful house is found in Reg. V (4, 11), *Bruttius Balbus* the aedile who lived modestly at IX, 2, 16, *Cuspius Pansa* whose house at IX, 1, 22, would hardly seem to fit the dignity of the earlier Pansa, four times II vir, *Albucius Celsum* whose home was the so-called "house of the silver wedding" (Mau-Kelsey, p. 301), and *Trebius Valens*, whose charming house has recently been found in Reg. III (No. 2, 1; *Notizie*, 1915, p. 416).

² Mau-Kelsey, p. 334.

conception of this kind of industrial life. The various workmen are busy at the furnace, the anvil, and the workbench, but at the center one is engaged in making a sale. Except for the fact that Pompeii had a greater proportion of non-slave artisans than the metropolis, these combination workshop-salesrooms were typical of all normal Roman industry. It was from shops like these that the Roman usually got his shoes and his togas, his jewelry and his lamps, his furniture, his house ornaments, and his kitchen utensils.

The first impression then upon walking around any normal block at Pompeii is of a busy hive with countless small cells where poor artisans make and sell their few specialties, but where the space within is occupied by prosperous men who in part direct and live upon the fruits of this petty industry. A larger survey of the whole city, however, will lead to a more complex definition of the city's industrial life; and for such a survey it is of first importance to examine the articles of commerce discovered in the shops and in particular the articles that bear inscriptions and trade-marks. The ordinary terra cotta tableware¹ was certainly imported. A large part of it came from the well-known potteries of Arretium, while the firms of Puteoli² and Capua and the new potteries of Gaul supplied the rest. There is no evidence that Pompeian potteries made any "Arretine" ware. Indeed even the simple *mortaria*³ that are so numerous in Pompeii were generally imported. At least many of them bear the mark of famous Roman tile-makers whereas none has a brand known from native ware.

On the other hand all the very crude and bulky terra cotta articles such as tiles⁴ and wine jars were made near by. In fact the ware of L. Visellius, most popular at Herculaneum, is the only one that extends freely over several Campanian towns. It is noteworthy also that while more than fifty producers supplied such ware only two or three makers are represented by any considerable number of stamps. There was therefore no monopoly in these articles. It is very probable that, as at Rome, tile-making was considered practically a branch of agriculture and that any farmer who found

¹ *CIL*, X, 8055 and 8056; also Atkinson, in *Journal of Rom. Stud.*, IV, 27.

² *Bull. dell' Istituto*, 1875, p. 242.

³ *CIL*, X, 8048.

⁴ *CIL*, X, 8049, 50.

that he had suitable clay was apt to burn tiles and jars for his own use and also if convenient for neighboring customers.

The splendid silver plate¹ that the rich Pompeian set upon his table was in large part the product of Campanian and Roman shops. The only piece of the Boscoreale trove that bears a maker's signature is a mirror signed by a Roman citizen, presumably of freedman stock, M. Domitius Polygnos; all the marks of ownership are Latin; and two of the finest cups portray Augustus and Tiberius in scenes taken presumably from Roman triumphal arches.² If these excellent pieces could be made in Italy the rest may well have been, though of course some of the patterns are obviously Alexandrian. Even Pompeian craftsmen may have produced work of this kind, for there were silversmiths³ in the town. Perhaps we may go a step further and say that the production of such ware had passed to a large extent out of the hands of independent handicraftsmen into the control of large producers. If in such shops the principle of division of labor had been introduced so that each workman performed a set task instead of producing complete articles, we can explain why so few of these elaborate pieces are signed, why themes and designs from Egypt, Syria, and Rome occur side by side, why on certain pieces the engraving, the molded design, and the *emblemata* often fail to harmonize, and finally why Italian inscriptions mention specialists in silverwork who obviously were tied to some very circumscribed part of the work, as for instance the *figurator*, the *flaturarius*, the *tritor*, the *inaurator*, and the *caelator*.⁴ Pliny indeed seems to refer to shops of large output when he complains that the fashion in silver plate changed, demanding *nunc Furniana*, *nunc Clodiana*, *nunc Gratiana*.⁵ It is doubtful whether individual craftsmen could so have influenced the market.

¹ For the Boscoreale treasure see *Mons. Piot.*, V.

² Cf. Mrs. Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 83. For the skill of silversmiths in Italy see Pliny *N.H.* XXXIV, 47.

³ The *Argentarii* stand sponsor for a candidate (IV, 710); a *caelator* is mentioned in *Notizie*, 1912, p. 69.

⁴ See Schreiber, *Alexandrinische Toreutik*, p. 132; Gummerus, *Die röm. Industrie* (Klio, 1914), p. 129; Drexel, *Bonn. Jahrb.*, 1909, p. 176.

⁵ Pliny uses the phrase *genus officinae* in this passage (*N.H.* xxxiii. 139). However, that *individual craftsmen* quickly accepted the prevailing styles would be natural. One such silversmith (VI, 9222) claimed pre-eminence in *caelatura Clodiana*. See Wright, *Class. Weekly*, XI, 17, for the meaning of the word *officina*.

Ironware seldom bears inscriptions or trade-marks, but it seems to be significant that the excavators at Pompeii frequently find what we might call "hardware stores," which are merely salesrooms without any place for production attached. The explanation apparently lies in the proximity¹ of Puteoli which Diodorus (V. 13) says had grown to be a very important center of metal production. The smiths of Pompeii did not try to compete with those large concerns.

It is interesting too that such shops often contain cheap *objets d'art* of bronze, which may therefore have come with the iron utensils from the foundries of Puteoli. Most of them are so inartistic that one might safely infer factory production in the mass rather than individual craftsmanship. That the Campanian artists working in bronze could produce very creditable statuary is, of course, not to be denied. Portraits like the meticulous bust of Caecilius Jucundus are very probably Campanian work, but the great bulk of the pleasing if rather uninspired philosophers, maenads, and fauns that decorated the halls and gardens of Pompeii and Herculaneum came apparently by the shipload from the art dealers of Athens. They are of a type with the foundered cargo of bronzes² that was discovered a few years ago near the African coast.

The numerous bronze buckets, ladles, and pots for table as well as for kitchen use, pleasing in shape and often artistically decorated, came largely, as Willers has proved, from extensive factories in Capua. Of the producers he says: "Their articles were sent even to Scotland and Northern Sweden. These men we must consider rich manufacturers who employed thousands of slaves in their factories."³

In wheat milling and bread-making, as we have seen, wholesale proportions might be reached. That this was also the case at Rome we may infer from the elaborate frieze on the baker's tomb at Porta Maggiore. Certain it is that at Pompeii handmills and bread ovens are seldom found in private houses. It is not unlikely that some of

¹ See, e.g., *Notizie*, 1912, pp. 333 and 355, and 1913, p. 31: collections of farm implements, kitchen utensils, locks and keys, harness, etc.

² Cf. *Journal Hell. Stud.*, 1903, p. 217; Benndorf, *Wiener Jahreshefte*, 1901, p. 169. The Metropolitan Museum has an Eros of excellent quality credited to Boscoreale, *Mus. Cat. Bronzes*, No. 131.

³ Willers, *Bronzezeimer von Hemmoor*, p. 213; also *Neue Untersuchungen üb. die röm. Bronzeindustrie*, 1907.

the large ovens were for community use, as is frequently the case in Italian towns today, but strictly speaking homemade bread was practically unknown.

There must have been some wholesale trade in wine,¹ since the trade-marks upon the amphorae bear witness to the importation of Coan, Cnidian, Sicilian, not to speak of Falernian and Cumaeian brands. Perhaps Cornelius Hermeros was a wholesale wine merchant,² since his mark occurs upon several brands of imported as well as old domestic wines and other "bottled goods." However, no large wine dealer's storehouse has as yet been discovered in Pompeii, and among the thousand or more marks repetitions of names are relatively so infrequent that it would be quite misleading to assume an organized system of middlemen wine dealers. Judging from the frequency with which estates³ are named upon the jars we should attribute the personal names and initials partly to owners of vineyards and partly to responsible *vilici* of wine-producing estates.⁴ We may conclude therefore that wine was usually supplied to owners and private cellars directly from vineyards, just as the wine growers of the Alban hills even now send down their cartloads to Rome every morning.

Large-scale factory methods are well illustrated in the production by the wealthy duumvir Umbricius Scaurus and his freedmen of the famous fish sauces called *garum*⁵ and *liquamen*. The constant discovery at Pompeii of jars bearing the familiar trade-marks of this

¹ *CIL*, IV, 5510-6600.

² M. Fabius Euporus, known as *princeps libertinorum* on an election notice (IV, 117), was apparently a well-known business man about town, as witness his name upon the banker's accounts. His label on a wine jar (No. 5535) implies that he was a dealer in Cnidian wine. M. Stlaborius Nymphodotus, also known to the banker Jucundus, seems to have been a dealer in *vinum vetus* (5526). One jar (5894) bears a record of the shipping office: *in nave Cn. Senti Omeri, Ti. Claudii Orpei vect <a>*. As is well known, Pompeian wine was also shipped to Rome, and the very trade-mark mentioned by Pliny ("Trifolium," *N.H.* xiv. 70) has been discovered (IV, 5518).

³ For example, in the house of the Vettii, three jars are marked, respectively, *de Arriano*, *de Asiniano*, and *de Formiano*. Cf. 5520: *ex fund. Badiano*.

⁴ For example, a villa near Boscotrecase lay under the management of a certain L. Arellius Successus as appears from a *signaculum*; a wine jar found at the same place was trade-marked L.A.S.(No. 5778). Again a villa near the walls known from brick stamps as the property of the ill-fated Agrippa Postumus (6499) has supplied a jar with the name of the *vilicus*, Νεικασίου ΑΤΡ —.

⁵ *CIL*, IV, 5657 ff.

producer proves the magnitude of the business, and the prominence of his mark shows how nearly his firm secured a monopoly of the trade at home. Here too is one of the few Pompeian products that reached a foreign market. Pliny knew the *garum* of Pompeii as one of the three best known brands and indeed a jar marked *gar. Pompeian.* has been found at Rome.¹ Despite the success of Scaurus, however, there were epicures in his native town who craved the best brand, the *garum* of the large firm *sociorum* of Spain.² A jar bearing this trade-mark was found in the house of M. Gavius Rufus.

Another product naturally demanding factory methods for its successful production is suggested by the large tannery³ of Regio I, 5 with its twelve huge tanks for the curing of hides. In this industry capital was required to tide over the time necessary for curing. Moreover, the space and the tanks devoted to the various processes involved could quite as readily be utilized for a large number of hides as for a few. Hence it may well be that all the leather needed in the town came to be made in one or two tanneries.

We are far from well informed about the organization of the clothing trade in the Roman world, and it may be that Pompeii will some day provide the essential facts for solving the problem. The mountains between Pompeii and Amalfi must have furnished pasture⁴ for thousands of sheep, and that the city became an important center in the clothing trade is shown by the inordinate number of elaborate fulleries that took possession of old-fashioned houses in several parts of the city. In the Middle Ages when the manufacturing of clothing first emerged from the state of household production it often happened that the wool grower, or the weaver, or the fuller assumed the rôle of entrepreneur and organized the trade of a country district by purchasing the wool and directing it from spinner to weaver and so on from house to house until the finished article was ready for the market. When

¹ It is noteworthy, however, that though the industry was so closely connected with Scaurus it seems not to have been brought under one management and one roof. Perhaps Scaurus set up sheds at several places along the shore where fishermen were apt to come in. The more usual brands are *G(ari) F(los) ex officina Scauri, ab Umbria, ab Umbricio Abascanto, G. F. Scauri ex off. Agathopi.*

² Pliny, *N.H.* xxxi. 94; Martial xiii. 102.

³ Mau-Kelsey, p. 395.

⁴ Cf. Seneca *Nat. Q.* vi. 27.

presently an export trade developed the drapers or cloth merchants further organized the trade and brought the goods together in a community hall, like Blackwell Hall in London, where individual purchasers might choose their goods and whence the agents of the drapers' guild might go to offer the surplus on the foreign market for the common benefit of all the guild members. Large factories seldom arose until the invention of machinery required the collection of the various craftsmen at some common point where the requisite power could be had.¹

At Pompeii it is evident from the ubiquitous whorls and weights that spinning and weaving remained in the household; and the list of assignments scratched on a pillar of the house of Terentius Eudoxus² shows how the eleven slave maids of one house employed their spare time. Indeed so long as the very simple processes of spinning and weaving could conveniently utilize the unoccupied energies of such housefolk, which would otherwise go to waste, it is clear that there would be neither a demand for high-power machinery nor the possibility of large-scale production in factories. And that explains why guilds of spinners and weavers did not arise in ancient Italy.

But with the subsequent processes of cloth-making it was different. Homespun from the household loom was now no longer used even by people of moderate means. It had to be sent to the fuller who put it through an elaborate treatment of cleansing and bleaching,³ of stamping, carding, and shearing. Then the dyer, whose work might or might not be done in the fullery, finished the cloth into a delicate product of which the figures in Pompeian wall paintings give a faded impression. At Pompeii the fullery with its expensive system of vats, its complex trade-processes, and its group of skilled workmen may fairly be called a factory; but it is at once characteristic of the ancient conservative methods that no fullery outgrew the relatively narrow confines of the ordinary dwelling-house.

¹ Cf. Ashley, *The Economic Organization of England*, p. 90.

² Insula VI, 13, 6; cf. *CIL*, IV, 1507.

³ Cf. Pliny *N.H.* xxxv. 198. He reveals the interesting fact here that the censors in 210 B.C. had a law passed against the abuse of adulterants by fullers. At Pompeii the city owned a fullery, as the wax tablets of Jucundus prove. Could it be that Pompeii had put this in to encourage the woolen trade?

And yet at Pompeii the fullers seem to have taken an unusual step toward the organization of the whole trade. In the early empire, Eumachia, a generous priestess, built an extensive hall near the forum for the use of the fullers.¹ This building is certainly not a fullery, and it can hardly be anything but a hall for sales booths, such as Blackwell Hall in London. In other words it is very likely that, as often happened in England, the fullers, who were the last to handle the cloth in the process of manufacture, bought the stuffs outright, finished them, and became the distributors as well. So far we may safely go, but we do not yet know whether the fullers ever attempted to organize the whole trade by purchasing the raw wool and contracting for the spinning and weaving of it. Nor do we know whether, like the drapers' guilds of England, they ever attempted to market their goods abroad through corporate agents. Though Roman law would permit this² it would seem that such an economic development must have left a clear record somewhere, and this we do not possess. In Roman business it was more usual for a middleman trader to seek his own goods than for the manufacturers to employ salesmen.³

As for agriculture, we have long known from the famous treatises of Cato and Varro that farming had to a wide extent become a capitalistic enterprise by the middle of the second century B.C. We are now able to restore the picture of a typical plantation from the remains of a farmstead at Boscoreale,⁴ two miles beyond Pompeii. That the owner was a practical farmer is clearly apparent from the abundance of farm implements, wine vats, and the like. That, however, he was a man of urbane breeding and social connections, with wealth enough to gratify very fastidious tastes, is proved by the fact that his silver plate is now reckoned one of the special treasures of the Louvre.⁵

¹ Cf. Mau-Kelsey, p. 110.

² Cf. *Digest*, III, 42, 1.

³ See, for example, the pottery traders' orders to the potters in Gaul, in Déchelette, *Les vases ceramiques ornés*, I, 86.

⁴ Cf. *Monumenti Antichi*, Vol. VII, *La Villa Pompeiana*. For other villas near Pompeii, Barnabei, *La Villa di P. Fannio Sinistore*, 1901; and *Notizie* 1898, p. 495; 1899, pp. 15, 297, 392; 1910, p. 139.

⁵ Cf. *Mons Piot.*, V. Some of the bronze ornaments of this villa are now in the Field Columbian Museum, Chicago.

Whatever other plantation owners may have done, this landlord, from the point of view both of production and of consumption, was a part and parcel of the world's commerce and industry. So-called domestic economy has no place in his system of householding. He produced a few specialties for the market with a view to profit, caring little whether or not he succeeded in satisfying the needs of his household from his own estate. The main part of his farm was devoted to vine culture, as two strong presses and a storeroom of jars with a capacity of nearly twenty thousand gallons testify. That there was also provision for some olive growing is shown by a mill, a press, and jars of a few hundred gallons capacity. Little provision was made for stock raising and there was apparently small need for hay. A survey of the implement room is instructive. The abundance of hoes and picks and pruning hooks as well as the absence of scythes and hammers and shears indicates the narrow limits within which the work of the farm was confined. A small mill and oven show that there was grain enough for home use, but nothing has been found to bear out the orthodox assumption that a house of this sort should have a staff of slave women spinning and weaving. Since the soil near Vesuvius was too rich to be given over to pasture the farm probably produced no wool, and the clothes were probably bought. Moreover, the supposition that large plantations were independent of the market in the matter of labor and implements seems to break down here. It is hardly necessary to mention that the house was built by skilled masons, as the fashionable type of reticulate masonry indicates, frescoed by an expert painter from the city, decorated with terra cotta ornaments, and fitted up with standard bathtubs and an elaborate hot-water system that must have required the services of Pompeii's highest-priced plumbers. These things are in harmony with the silverware, the artistic bronzes, and the modish furniture. But even the implements of the stockroom are of the standard forms made by skilled artisans, the crudest pottery bears the factory stamp, and the bricks bear trade-marks known from Pompeii. In fact the landlord had proceeded far beyond the earlier practices of agriculture according to which the householder adapts his system of livelihood to the productions of his farm. This man's connections with his land were quite incidental. To him the

land was a factory for the production of a special article from the profits of which he could make a living. And he lived upon his farm, when he did, only because he chose to be near his business or because he liked the air, not because it gave him his bread and cheese and homespun.

We may now attempt to fit the various social classes into the economic scheme that we have found. In the first place agriculture must have been the most respectable occupation at Pompeii as at Rome, and there can be little doubt that it was a portion of the land—the vineyards of the Vesuvian slopes and the rich vegetable gardens below—rather than the shops of Pompeii which Sulla distributed among his veterans in 80 B.C. During the early years when the city government was controlled by the colonists these must have held all the higher offices; to that class must have belonged the Holconii, the Quinctii, and the numerous other magistrates whose liberality evoked inscriptional records. Yet, as we have seen, the profits of industry were frankly acknowledged, as witness the *Salve lucrum* of Vedius Siricus, the ubiquitous trade-mark of the fish packer, the tile stamps of Saginius and Eumachius, and the mills of Proculus, for all these men were elected to the magistracies.¹ If Caecilius Jucundus, the banker-auctioneer, who lived as luxuriously as any of these, failed to reach the duumvirate, lack of respectability could hardly have been the reason. He probably fell under the provisions of the *lex Julia municipalis* which disqualified the *praeco*² for municipal office, apparently in order to keep the “contractor out of politics.”

Of course much of the profitable business must have been carried on by trusted freedmen, as Cicero's letters prove that it was at Rome, but at Pompeii where many of the natives were Greeks and still bore Greek cognomina it is not an easy matter to recognize liberti by means of the nomenclature. At any rate on the streets of tombs the most elaborate monuments are as likely as not to boast the honors of a sevirate, thus betraying the rank of a freedman.

Slaves of course shared largely in the industrial life of the city and not only manual but also administrative work was intrusted to

¹ These magistracies were of course held in high esteem. Macrobius (*Sat.* ii, 3, 11) gives an anecdote of a Pompeian who asked for Cicero's support.

² The business accounts of Jucundus show that he not only took city contracts but also acted as agent in placing such contracts and in collecting public dues.

them. Very often the *signacula*, the seals and stamps used to brand goods and legalize documents, bear the name of a responsible slave as well as that of his master. The loaves of bread now in the Naples Museum for instance are marked *Celeris Q Grani Veri ser* (X, 8058, 18).

If we may judge from election notices, however, Pompeii seems to have had a comparatively large free population. The guild members who explicitly support candidates are not only the prosperous fullers, the millers, and the bakers; they are owners of small shops like the *aurifex* and the *veterarius*, the petty merchants of stalls and booths like the *pomari* and the *unguentari*, and there are also the workmen's groups of dyers (*offectores* and *infectores*), the porters (*saccari*), the harvest hands (*vindemitores*), and the woodworkers (*lignari*). To be sure such election posters do not permit the inference that every supporter is a citizen, but there would be little point to these announcements if the labor guilds consisted largely of slaves.¹ That there was a large free population of poor workmen may also be inferred from the inordinately great number of petty barrooms and lunch counters. The scores of these places in existence could only have been supported by poor but free folk who were in a position to spend a few sous daily for tidbits. Some of these laborers were independent craftsmen who managed their own small business in front of their two- or three-room houses. Such places are very numerous at Pompeii. Others were clients of the well-to-do, like the soldier-cobbler at IV, 3, who while making shoes served as porter to his former centurion. A very large number were ex-slaves whom after manumission their former master set up in some shop, usually on a percentage basis. It was to a freedman of this type that his patron erected the typical and luminous inscription (VI, 9222): "M. Canuleius Zosimus. He did nothing contrary to the advice of his master. Though he always had in his possession much silver and gold he never pilfered." Zosimus was apparently a silversmith to whom his master supplied the raw metal and the necessary capital.

¹ Cf. Della Corte, *Case ed abitanti a Pompeii* (Neapolis), II, 152 ff. These notices were painted by the candidate's hired advertiser, who went about town usually in the dead of night looking for suitable blank wall spaces for his advertisements. He was supposed to make his poster effective by securing definite promises of support, but at times he announced support without authorization. The usual inference that the guilds were "in politics" is by no means justified.

Such freedmen probably occupied the shops and booths connected with several of the larger houses in the block surveyed above.

To summarize, the methods of business prove to be not unlike those of Rome, clinging rather conservatively to the system of small shops and a narrow field of operation. Yet throughout the whole system industries appear in all stages of development toward capitalistic production. The woolen trade was just beginning to liberate itself from subjection to a haphazard series of disconnected household processes; baking, tanning, fulling, and the packing of fish products were well in the hands of specialists who commanded some capital; and finally a few large manufacturers had centralized in favorable localities the production of the best bronze utensils and *objets d'art*, of standard ironware, and of the better grades of pottery, and had done this so effectively that they commanded the trade of a large part of the Roman world.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE